

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated December 2, 2004, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,307,845 (Hummelgren); and claims 14 and 20 were rejected under § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,744,767 (Chiu).

Applicant acknowledges the indication that claims 4-13, 15-19, and 21-25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 4, 5, 7, 18, 21, and 25 have been amended from dependent form to independent form, with the scope of each claim remaining *unchanged*, to place the claims in condition for allowance. An amendment to the form of claim 7 has been made to replace “each” with “a” at line 9—however, it is respectfully submitted that this amendment does not change the scope of claim 7.

As amended, claim 1 is not disclosed by Hummelgren. Claim 1 now recites receiving, in a system, a data unit containing a source address indicating a source of a data unit; matching the source address with information stored in the system; and enabling entry of the data unit to the first network for communication to a destination device on the first network if the source address matches the information stored in the system and denying entry of the data unit to the first network if the source address does not match the information stored in the system, where the destination device is separate from the system.

In Hummelgren, the Office Action cited to Fig. 3, and passages in column 4, as disclosing the subject matter of claim 1. In Hummelgren, packets received from an Internet host are forwarded to an IP voice mailbox, which includes a look-up table containing the addresses of all mobile stations that use the IP voice mailbox. When the IP voice mailbox receives a packet, the IP voice mailbox compares the source address of the packet to the address entries in the look-up table. Hummelgren, 4:11-14. If a matching address is found in a table, then the IP voice mailbox stores the packet in the mailbox. However, if no match is found, the IP voice mailbox discards the packet. Hummelgren, 4:14-18.

The IP voice mailbox of Hummelgren does not enable or deny entry of a data unit to *a first network for communication to a destination device on the first network*. Instead, according to Hummelgren, upon receipt of a packet, the IP voice mailbox determines whether to store the packet in the mailbox or to discard the packet – there is no entry of the packet to a network for

communication to a destination device on the network that is separate from the IP voice mailbox of Hummelgren.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and its dependent claims, are not anticipated by Hummelgren.

Claim 14 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of former dependent claim 15, which was indicated by the Office Action as being allowable. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is now in condition for allowance.


Claims 15 and 20 have been cancelled, without prejudice, to render the rejection of the claims moot.

Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (NRT.0100US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Mar 1, 2005



Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883